

## **REMARKS**

The office action suggests that somehow the specific claim language utilized does not distinguish the reference. Referring to Figure 9, it is clear, beyond any reasonable dispute, that the channels in the reference result in circulation from one side to a point short of the other side and then back. Claim 1 calls for a trench that extends completely across one of said substrates “from edge to edge.” This seems to be even clearer than from side to side. In other words, there is no trench in the cited reference, as shown in Figure 9, that extends “completely” across the substrates and does so from edge to edge.

Therefore, reconsideration is requested. Claims 5 and 20 have been amended to overcome any possible issue of antecedent basis.

Claim 14 has been amended in accordance with the Examiner’s suggestions. However, it is not believed that it would be appropriate to call for the trench to extend through the substrate since that would imply through in a vertical direction, it would seem. Therefore, completely across from one side to the other seems to be what the Examiner is looking for and clearly distinguishes the reference.


Claim 18 is rejected over the Jankowski patent application in view of Ramanathan. Firstly, it is not clear that Ramanathan is a reference since its filing date is June 2004, it is a divisional of an application filed after the present application, and it is a continuation-in-part of an application filed before the present application.

However, even if we assume that the application that was continued-in-part includes material that predates material in the present application, the present application and the Ramanathan patent are assigned to a common assignee and were commonly owned at the time the invention was made. The application and the reference were, at the time the invention was made, owned by or subject to an obligation of assignment to, the same person. See M.P.E.P. § 706.02(1)2 at page 700-55. Therefore, the Section 103 rejection cannot stand.

As a result, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 18, claims 3-5, and claims 19-21 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 8, 2005



---

Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994  
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.  
8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100  
Houston, TX 77024  
713/468-8880 [Phone]  
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation